

To: House Tax Policy Committee
From: James P. Hallan, President and CEO, Michigan Retailers Association
Date: February 1, 2012
Subject: Michigan Main Street Fairness Legislation

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for your continued interest in efforts to level the uneven playing field on which Michigan retailers are forced to compete.

On behalf of the Michigan Retailers Association's 12,000 member storefronts, and on behalf of the Michigan Alliance for Main Street Fairness, we wholeheartedly support House Resolution 156 and commend Rep. Meadows for keeping a focus on this critical issue. Unfortunately, HR 156 does not go far enough. This committee must act on Michigan Main Street Fairness legislation, House Bills 5004 and 5005.

There has been a lot of recent activity on this issue and I would like to give you a quick update on efforts to level the playing field by closing the tax loophole that gives out-of-state, Internet retailers an unfair, 6 percent price advantage over Michigan job makers.

Since this Committee last discussed House Bills 5004 and 5005 we have seen a flurry of activity here in Michigan and across the United States.

- Dan Marshall, a retailer with seven Michigan-based music stores, traveled to Washington, D.C. to testify before the House Judiciary Committee about the importance of Main Street Fairness.
- Despite Dan's testimony there is zero indication that Congress plans to act on its own, making action here more urgent than ever. Congress wouldn't be paying any attention at all to this issue if a number of states hadn't moved on their own to remedy their own situation. The fact of the matter is that Michigan has the opportunity — and the obligation — to control our own destiny.
- While Michigan waits, other states have taken action to protect their job makers and moved forward with effective state solutions. Since this Committee last heard testimony on 5004 and 5005, California, Indiana and Texas have all acted and protected their small businesses. Now, nine states have acted legislatively, including New York, Illinois, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas and Vermont.
- Just last weekend the Detroit Free Press and Lansing State Journal published the results of a new EPIC / MRA survey that showed overwhelming support for the Michigan Main Street Fairness Act, with 54 percent of those polled in support of legislation that finally recognizes a sale is a sale is a sale, while only 39 percent opposed the legislation.

(MORE)

- The holiday sales season has come and gone with a couple of frightening developments. First, Amazon offered coupons to customers to go into brick-and-mortar locations, shop for the product of their choice and then order the products directly from Amazon using their mobile devices. The trend of stores becoming showcases for Amazon is just not right. It's also destructive to our economy. Second, Internet sales increased some 15% during the holidays, nearly four times the amount for Michigan-based retailers.

Retailers hire based on sales. Sales made to pure Internet retailers, or vapor retailers, do not create jobs. Just listen to what some of these Michigan job makers are saying:

Lynn MacDowell (Owner, MacDowell's in Grand Ledge):

"It is not unusual for customers to come into my store, see, touch and ask questions about products then turn around and purchase them online because the Internet retailer does not collect Michigan's 6% sales tax. Michigan has an unfair tax situation and it is time to level the playing field for retailers."

Kim Volz (Owner, The Dive Shop in Flint):

"At my store I'm fighting every day to make the sale. Just this week I lost an \$800 sale after spending hours with a customer on the showroom floor answering questions and demonstrating the equipment because the shopper was able to purchase the item from an online retailer that did not collect Michigan's sales tax. This is a fairness issue."

Matt Norcross (Owner, McLean and Eakin Booksellers in Petoskey):

"Right now our store is used as a showroom for online retailers who avoid collecting Michigan's sales tax. Shoppers come into our store, scan barcodes right in front of us and purchase those items online. We're up to the challenge of competing in this economy, but small businesses cannot also compete with an uneven playing field."

Barb Stein (Owner, Great Northern Trading Company in Rockford):

"Small business owners are up to the challenge of competing in this economy, but the online sales tax loophole means we also have to compete with an uneven playing field. Closing the loophole is about fairness, but it is also about protecting Michigan businesses and investment in our communities. It is time the Legislature did the right thing and stand up for their hometown job makers."

Again, this is not a tax issue. This is a simple fairness issue. Other states are taking steps to correct this basic inequity. Shouldn't we be doing the same?

- Finally, last week these job makers, and other small business owners from across the state, banded together and launched the Michigan Main Street Leadership Council, a steering committee created to drive home the point that sales create jobs and every sale to a vapor retailer represents the very real potential for job losses here in Michigan.

Please stand up for Michigan job makers and pass House Bills 5004 and 5005 immediately. Thank you.

###

Hearing on the
Constitutional Limitations on States' Authority to Collect Sales Tax in E-Commerce

Before the
Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

November 30, 2011

Testimony of
Paul Misener
Vice President for Global Public Policy
Amazon.com

Thank you, Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Conyers, for inviting me to testify. Amazon has long supported an even-handed federal framework for state sales tax collection and, to that end, we have participated in the Streamlined Sales Tax Project for over a decade, and we are pleased to participate in this hearing. Amazon strongly supports enactment of a federal bill with appropriate provisions.

Mr. Chairman, Congress – and only Congress – may, should, and feasibly can authorize the states to require out-of-state sellers to collect the sales tax already owed.

At the Philadelphia Convention, which the Founders convened principally to consider the challenging issue of trade among the states, Congress was granted exclusive power to regulate interstate commerce. Exactly two centuries later, in 1987, North Dakota challenged this exclusivity and, following five years of litigation, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Quill v. North Dakota* that requiring out-of-state sellers to collect tax would impose an unconstitutional burden on interstate commerce. The *Quill* court also confirmed that Congress eventually could “disagree with our conclusions” and that this issue is “not

only one that Congress may be better qualified to resolve, but also one that Congress has the ultimate power to resolve.”

Far from an e-commerce "loophole," the constitutional limitation on states' authority to collect sales tax is at the core of our Nation's founding principles. For this reason, Amazon has steadfastly opposed state attempts to require out-of-state sellers to collect absent congressional authorization.

Mr. Chairman, Congress *should* authorize the states to require collection, with the great objects of protecting states' rights, addressing the states' needs, and leveling the playing field for all sellers.

States' rights should be protected. States need the freedom to make their own revenue policy choices. For example, Texas has chosen to eschew personal income tax, and that decision makes the Texas budget particularly sensitive to uncollected sales tax. The right of Texas to make this policy choice effective should be protected. Congress should protect the states' rights, and authorize them to require collection of sales tax revenue already owed, and doing so would not violate pledges that are limited to questions of income tax rates and deductions.

The states' financial needs should be addressed. The states face serious budget shortfalls, yet the federal government faces its own fiscal challenges. Congress should help address the states' budget shortfalls without spending federal funds, by authorizing the states to require collection of the billions of revenue dollars already owed.

Fairness among sellers should be created and maintained. Sellers should compete on a level playing field. Congress should not exempt too many sellers from collection, for these sellers will obtain a lasting *un-level* playing field versus Main Street and other retailers. Congress should rectify the current imbalance and avoid a future imbalance.

Mr. Chairman, Congress feasibly *can* authorize the states to require collection. The facts in the *Quill* decision arose a quarter of a century ago, and the Supreme Court's decision was rendered a year before the World Wide Web was invented. With today's computing and communications technology, widespread collection no longer would be an unconstitutional burden on interstate commerce, and Congress feasibly can authorize the states to require all but the very smallest volume sellers to collect.

Much attention has been paid to the size of a "small seller exception" threshold in federal legislation – and rightfully so. Such a threshold, which would exempt some sellers from a collection requirement, must be kept very low to attain the objectives of protecting states' rights, addressing the states' needs, and creating fairness among sellers.

In this context, several kinds of small volume sellers must be considered.

Foremost are the Main Street small business retailers who, unless the small seller exception threshold is kept very low, will forever face an *un-level* playing field compared to a newly-created exempt class of out-of-state sellers.

Next are the online advertising affiliates, tens of thousands of whom have lost jobs or income as the result of ineffective, counterproductive sales tax laws recently enacted in a half-dozen states. Congress should act to make such laws uninteresting and irrelevant to the states – and thereby immediately restore the lost jobs and income – by authorizing the states to require collection.

Small volume online sellers have received most of the attention, and not without reason. No one wants these sellers to shoulder alone burdens compared to those faced by the small business retailers who already collect sales tax in our local communities. Yet no one should want these online sellers to take advantage of a newly-created *un*-level playing field over small Main Street businesses, and no one should want government to pick business model winners and losers this way.

The consequences of the threshold level to states' rights, the states' needs, and fairness are very significant, because a surprisingly large fraction of e-commerce is conducted by smaller volume sellers. For example, nearly 30% of uncollected sales tax revenue today is attributable to sellers with annual online sales below \$150,000, and only one percent of online sellers sell more than this amount. In other words, a \$150,000 exception would deny the states nearly 30% of the newly-available (yet already owed) revenue, but would exempt from collection 99% of online sellers. Any higher threshold would deny the states even more revenue and keep the playing field even more un-level.

Fortunately, today's computing and communications technology will allow all online sellers to collect and remit tax like Main Street retailers.

Large volume online sellers already have and use this technology. Amazon and Overstock, for example, collect tax on sales to consumers in states where our retail businesses have nexus. And the online arms of large multichannel retailers collect in the states where they have retail stores. Quite obviously, state sales tax can be collected nationwide, at least by larger volume sellers like Amazon, Overstock, and the multichannel stores, for they have the technology.

This technology is not limited to large sellers. Rather, service providers also make the technology available to medium and small volume sellers. Thus, collection is either *by* sellers or *for* sellers. There are many service providers already: ADP, Avalara, and FedEx, for example.

Two other examples come to mind: Amazon and eBay.

Both companies use sophisticated computing and communications technology to serve their seller customers. But, while Amazon is prepared to make its technology available as a service to help sellers by collecting sales tax for them, eBay seeks to avoid any role in collection, claiming that small volume sellers will be burdened and, implicitly, that eBay's technology is not capable of helping its largest sellers to collect. And these claims are made despite the fact that eBay manages to collect the transaction fees it charges its sellers, and despite the fact that eBay already calculates state sales tax for eBay sellers, all the way down to the local jurisdiction level. Amazon and many other service providers will help smaller online sellers collect; surely eBay can as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, Congress may, should, and feasibly can attain the objectives of protecting states' rights, addressing the states' needs without federal spending, and leveling the playing field for all sellers – but only if any “small seller exception” is kept very low.

The time to act is nigh. Amazon is grateful for this hearing, and we look forward to working with you and your colleagues in Congress to pass appropriate legislation as soon as possible.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

* * * * *